

# **P L A N N I N G   C O M M I S S I O N**

## **ACTION MINUTES**

**TUESDAY, APRIL 5, 2005**

Chair Parsons called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at the Twin Pines Senior and Community Center.

### **1.        ROLL CALL:**

Present, Commissioners:                Parsons, Dickenson, Frautschi, Gibson,  
Long, Wozniak, Horton

Absent, Commissioners:                None

Present, Staff:                                Community Development Director Ewing  
(CDD), Principal Planner de Melo (PP), Associate Planner Swan (AP), City  
Attorney Zafferano (CA), Recording Secretary Flores (RS)

### **2.        AGENDA AMENDMENTS:**

**MOTION:     By C Gibson, seconded by C Dickenson, to add an item to the agenda allowing the Commission to choose an alternate or replacement for him on the Permit Efficiency Task Force. Motion passed unanimously.**

Chair Parsons stated that the item will be discussed under Item 6, Reports, Studies, Updates and Comments.

**3.        COMMUNITY FORUM (Public Comments):                None**

### **4.        CONSENT CALENDAR:**

#### **4A.       Minutes of 3/1/05 Planning Commission Meeting**

**MOTION:     By VC Dickenson, seconded by C Horton, to accept the Action Minutes of Tuesday, March 1, 2005.**

**Ayes:                Dickenson, Horton, Frautschi, Gibson, Long, Wozniak, Parsons**

**Noes:                None**

**Motion passed 7/0.**

## **5. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

### **5A. PUBLIC HEARING – 2516 Read Avenue**

**To consider a Single Family Design Review to construct a 626 square foot addition to the existing 1,757 square foot single-family residence for a total of 2,383 square feet that is below the zoning district permitted 2,400 square feet for the site. The project includes second floor additions and a new entry for the existing split level residence.**

**(Appl. No. PA2004-0035)**

**APN: 044-032-200; Zoned: R-1B (Single Family Residential)**

**CEQA Status: Categorically Exempt, Section 15301**

**Applicant/Owners: Vayel & Grace Palanjian**

AP Swan summarized the staff report, recommending approval subject to the conditions of approval as attached.

Sol Askijian, Architect for the project, introduced himself and was available to answer questions.

C Frautschi asked what the applicant plans to do with the open space area that is not counted as floor area beneath the new addition. Mr. Askijian replied that they are required to have at least two openings, and that he believed the applicant's motive or intention would be to have landscaping under it.

C Horton suggested that the white on white color palette seemed monochromatic and, given that the house is bulky, they might want to do something to minimize that. Mr. Askijian stated that it is actually a slightly salmon color with white trim and windows.

Chair Parsons noted that it is not clear from the drawings if there is going to be a fireplace. Mr. Askijian responded that it is a structural issue, they would prefer to have a pre-fabricated fireplace, but not having one would be acceptable. AP Swan added that the fireplace chimney was omitted after staff commented that it was above the blank space where there was supposed to be an opening. CDD Ewing noted that if it were a masonry fireplace it clearly couldn't happen over an open space, but that the

Commission could approve the project with the fireplace and if it comes out in Plan Check then the project is less than what they approved.

C Wozniak asked the applicant if they would consider planting the required 3 trees for cutting down the Oak in the front instead of paying the in-lieu fees. The applicant responded that they had not decided which way to go. C Wozniak added that she would like to see a more complete Landscape Plan and Mr. Askijian said that they could provide that.

Chair Parsons opened the public hearing. No one came forward to speak.

**MOTION: By Commissioner Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner Gibson, to close the public hearing. Motion passed.**

C Gibson did not believe the space underneath would work very well visually or functionally. He predicted it would invite a family of skunks and felt that the second floor jutting out so far is too much bulk. He would rather see the second story pushed back and made flush with the first floor, even at the expense of more grading.

C Long was drawn to the fact that the partially enclosed area could be converted into usable space for the house but thought it was acceptable space. He felt it was tall enough space that he was not as worried about vermin under there as he was about making it usable landscape or usable space to contribute to the house. He had some issues with the bulk but felt that overall the improvement to the site probably outweighed the way it leaned in the direction of excessive bulk.

C Frautschi agreed that the design does improve the site and that the cantilevered design had inherent problems. He added that he had a problem approving the design because: 1) there is potential that further living space could very easily be created and felt it could be in this design; 2) the lack of a fully articulated Landscape Plan, especially since the addition is on the front of the house; and 3) if they want a fireplace there should be a way to design it to have a fireplace.

C Wozniak concurred with what had already been said and would like to see as many trees added back as possible because the area would lend itself to more trees and would also screen the house. She also felt that darker colors would make the whole house blend in.

C Horton agreed with the previous comments, noting that the area that is underneath the addition clearly has enough head room to be used and left her a little suspicious.

VC Dickenson concurred that he would like to see a more detailed Landscape Plan since they are front-loading the bulk of the building.

Chair Parsons stated that in his estimation a fully articulated Landscape Plan was a definite requirement. He felt that the new addition could be dropped down two or three feet to lower the profile of the front of the house if it requires steps going up to the kitchen or the bedroom wing. He was leaning towards the idea that they should not be approving a project that creates a built-in space for future development.

C Long asked Director Ewing for his comments on whether it is in the Commission's purview to be considering the potential to have an unauthorized addition in an area that is enclosed on two sides but not on four and looks primed to be walled in and made into usable space. CDD Ewing responded that staff had spent quite a bit of time talking about the space when they were looking at the project, and concluded that with the records that they keep showing what the plans were and what was approved, any enclosure would have to be either reviewed by the Commission with a variance for floor area or would be illegal if it were done without such approval. They focused on the issue of bulk, given that it really is the volume of two stories regardless of how the first floor is used.

**MOTION:** By C Gibson, seconded by C Long, to continue for redesign to May 3, 2005, the Single Family Design Review for 2516 Read Avenue. The aim is to 1) reduce the bulk in the front of the house so that it does not stick out so far, 2) provide a comprehensive Landscape Plan, and 3) provide a finished, more accurate color board. (Appl. PA2004-0035)

**Ayes: Gibson, Long, Frautschi, Horton, Wozniak, Dickenson, Parsons**

**Noes: None**

**Motion Passed 7/0**

At the Commission's request, staff will encourage the applicant to consider using darker colors and inclusion of mitigation trees as a condition of approval.

## **5B. PUBLIC HEARING – 2702 Monte Cresta Drive**

To consider a Single Family Design Review and Variance to construct a new 2,062 square foot single family residence that is below the zoning district permitted 2,159 square feet for this site.

(Appl. No. 2003-0037) (Continued from 10/5/04 Planning Commission Hearing)

APN: 043-311-860; Zoned: R-1B (Single Family Residential)

CEQA Status: Categorical Exemption per Section 15303

Applicant/Owner: Gurpreet Sachdeva

PP de Melo summarized the staff report, recommending approval of the Variances and Single Family Design Review subject to the conditions of approval as attached.

Staff answered questions from the Commission as follows:

- The height of the building is 37' from the bottom of the garage door to the peak of the house.
- The retaining wall would be reduced roughly no more than half a foot if the driveway was increased from 16% to the maximum of 18%.
- The retaining wall is shot crete, which is formed as it is finished during the construction process. Photographs of sample shot crete walls were provided to the Commission.

Gurpreet Sachdeva, owner/applicant, recapped the progress they had made since the project was last reviewed by the Commission in October 2004, and reviewed the background of the project.

Jerry Chapman, designer, explained how they took the suggestions from the Commission and applied them to a redesign for the project. Changes included: 1) moved the house to the east so that it is 80-95 feet away from the closest neighbor; 2) reduced excavation by about 140 yards of dirt; 3) brought the garage down and lowered the building by 16 to 20' by shifting it on the property, eliminating any of the infill; 4) eliminated possible living space over the garage; 5) changed the front of the house so that it does not appear to have the large, massive look and is only 6' above grade on the hill; and 7) added landscaping.

C Gibson stated his concern as to whether it would be necessary to build retaining walls within the City right of way prior to the property line. Ted Sayer of Cotton, Shires and Associates, stated that if they can achieve a reasonable slope so they do not have an over steepened condition above the walls where they are trying to taper them down to nothing he would not have a problem with that approach, but that he would hate to taper the wall off to nothing with the tradeoff being a very steep cut. Mr. Chapman said that the primarily reason for flaring into the grade behind the property line is so they can leave the old growth along the street line that is there now and

that the geotech is going to be involved at the construction stage, will be there periodically for inspections, and will make sure it is going to work.

C Frautschi asked Mr. Chapman if he had considered placing the staircase into the house on the right side of the house. Mr. Chapman responded that placing it on the right side would have meant taking out another 50-60 yards of dirt just to accommodate the staircasing and would require additional retaining walls to protect the stairs and the slope. He added that when they do the excavation around that area they plan to have an arborist on-site so that if they come across any of the root structure there will be a person there to address that.

Discussion ensued between C Frautschi and Mr. Chapman regarding the endangered trees that are on the neighboring property, with the assurance by Mr. Chapman that no soil nailing will occur on the right side of the project.

Chair Parsons questioned the advisability of having wooden stairs between the two retaining walls, as spelled out in the staff report and on the drawings. Mr. Chapman concurred, and stated that they will be concrete steps that are tied in structurally to the retaining walls.

Responding to Chair Parsons' question, Mr. Chapman stated that he did the Landscape Plan based on having lived in the area for 30 years, and chose plants that seem to be deer proof and drought tolerant.

VC Dickenson asked Mr. Sayer if he had received enough information regarding the turn of the retaining walls. Mr. Sayer replied that he was concerned about the cuts. He understands that they will try to achieve a 1½:1 maximum cut slope and that the existing cut slope by the roadway is almost 1:1, and that there is no way to avoid tapering into that existing slope. He added that the 1:1 cut has been relatively stable because it is bedrock material that has been cut into so there is a relatively shallow mantle of soil over relatively hard rock material that forms most of the face of the cut. He agreed that it is appropriate that the project geotechnical engineer be there during the excavation and determine the final graded slopes to make sure that whatever condition is reached in the final grade can be stabilized.

Chair Parsons opened the public hearing and asked speakers to limit their comments to two minutes.

Jaime Dal Porto, Barclay Way, stated that they continue to be concerned with the proposed home, primarily with the 42% slope and the soil stability.

Larry Blake, Barclay Way, stated that his property is uphill from the projected project and he was concerned about slippage or soil erosion of the site and the concern that the proposed construction requires significant grading could impact the stability of the adjacent properties, particularly on the upslope of the proposed building site.” He was concerned that removing all of that earth could possibly create a chain reaction and intends to have a geological surveyor monitor his property to make sure that there is no slippage, adding that if there is any disturbance of his property there will be a law suit.

Arnold Ramos, San Ardo Way, stated that his concerns are the same as they were in October, and added that there is a house being built across the street from him. His fence has separated about 1¼” and his house has dropped about 5/8” since October. He is also concerned about the pollution caused by the new construction and parking.

Joe Dal Porto, Barclay Way, noted that in addition to the concerns already stated, he asked the Commission to take into consideration his understanding that the owner intends to pursue a second home on his lots, and that approval of this project opens the door for further building on the second site.

**MOTION: By C Frautschi, seconded by C Long, to close the public hearing. Motion passed.**

Commissioners commented as follows:\_

C Gibson

- He heard the neighbors’ concerns, but since three licensed geotechnical engineers have blessed this project, it is difficult for the Commission to naysay their professional opinion.
- As far as the other lot is concerned, he stated that they have to rule on the project that is before them, and if and when the applicant comes in with another project they will rule on that.
- Since San Ardo was built on fill many years ago he did not believe the problems there are related to the geology on the uphill side of Monte Cresta.
- He was concerned about the cut on City property and requested that a representative of the City look at it at the time and make sure it is ok.
- He felt that the project is a distinct improvement over what they saw before and could support it with that addition.

### C Frautschi

- This is a very difficult site that should have an original, site-specific plan and it concerned him that the applicant had stated that he had looked at another plan to come up with his plan.
- Regarding the Variance request, he was concerned about item (e) which states that "granting of the Variance will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or be materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity."
- Liked the arborist's list of mitigations to protect the trees on the right side of the property, and wanted to look at protecting them for the suggested maximum of 5 years.
- Felt more secure about the geological issue due to the recent letter from Cotton, Shires and what the staff report is asking for to make sure that the digging is done right.
- Did not like the choice of "zoo rock" for the driveway.
- Felt that the landscape plan needed to be more articulated and did not think it was acceptable that the tree mitigations would not happen on-site.
- Would like to see driveway keyholes about 2' x 1' against the retaining walls to be used for plants that would grow onto the walls and reduce the actual bulk of the walls.
- Suggested that they could further reduce the bulk of the house with the addition of a metal or wood arbor for plants that would go over the garage door and actually soften the house.

### C Wozniak

- Shotcrete reminded her of Highway 92 on the way to Half Moon Bay; it doesn't look residential to her at all, and anything that can be done to change it or soften the face of it would be great.
- Agreed that the site needs a professional Landscape Plan. Felt they should be looking at more native plants that do not need so much pruning.
- Still concerned about the bulk and the height of the building and still thinks it is bulky.
- Still concerned about the stability of the site.
- Agreed that they are looking at this house on its own and if something is built next door they'll have to look at that on its own.

### C Horton

- The plan has come a long way. She was no longer so concerned with the bulk and concurred with C Frautschi that there is a large void above the garage door that could be mitigated with a trellis or something like that.



- She thought they might want to put a washer and dryer in the house, at least for resale purposes.
- No longer as concerned about stability as the lot appears to be embedded in rocks.
- Felt there needs to be an irrigation system included in the Landscape Plan.

#### C Long

- Very impressed by the changes made and by the way the applicant listened to the Commission.
- Expressed his empathy for some of the speakers.
- Directed Mr. Blake's attention to the geotechnical engineers who make their living and have insurance for their decisions, adding that the Commission has to rely on the experts and it would be very difficult to go against that.
- Loved the idea of the trellis over the garage and the vines along the driveway, and agreed that some improvements to the landscaping are needed.
- Could support the project based on some minor changes that have been mentioned.

#### C Dickenson

- Thanked the applicant for his efforts on minimizing the mass of the building and tucking it up into the site.
- Very concerned with the grading; even with a geotechnical engineer on site, he did not believe he would be able to hold the dirt back if something does come down. He could not find in the affirmative for Finding (e) of the Variance or Finding (d) of the Single Family Design Review, both relating to the geotechnical.

#### Parsons

- Glad to hear that the retaining walls and the stairs are going to be tied together and be concrete.
- Had some real concerns still about how that wall is actually going to work and how it is going to tie into the hillside and at the top at the house.

- Concurs that the applicant will have to come up with a better finish on the walls.
- Liked the idea of softening the front of the house with a trellis and cutting some pockets in the driveway along the walls for plant materials.
- The Landscape Plan is lacking; even native plants need some water to get them through the first few years. He felt it would be better to put money into hiring a landscape architect who is familiar with native plants and materials and can put something up there that is going to be easily maintained with a minimum amount of watering, as well as some kind of a sprinkler system.
- Wanted to see trees planted either on the upper side of the lot or somewhere on the front that replace the ones that are being taken out.
- Concluded with the proposal that the Commission approve this project with the condition that it come back with a professionally done Landscape Plan and more detailed design of the retaining walls and steps, revised wall finishes, and suggested that the applicant seriously think about putting a washer and dryer in the house.

**MOTION:** By C Frautschi, seconded by C Long, accepting the Variance of encroachment into the public right-of-way and Variance regarding the excess of 6' wall height at 2702 Monte Cresta Drive (Appl. 200-0037)

Ayes: Long, Gibson, Horton, Parsons

Noes: Frautschi, Wozniak, Dickenson

Motion passed 4/3

**MOTION:** By C Long, seconded by C Wozniak, to approve the Single Family Design Review to construct a new 2,062 square foot single family residence at 2702 Monte Cresta Drive subject to the attached conditions in Exhibit A with additional conditions that there be five years of scrutiny on the trees in the Arborist Report (i.e., the maximum that is listed in the staff report), that the details for the retaining wall and the steps and the interconnectiveness of the retaining wall to the house be brought before us for final approval, that we get an articulated Landscape Plan with irrigation brought before us for approval, and to have the City geologist ascertain whether there's a need to build an additional structure for support of the City property where that abuts this construction, and aesthetic treatment of the walls, and the keyholes in the driveway and a trellis over the driveway doors (Appl. 2003-0037)

CDD Ewing suggested that rather than identifying solutions the issues are 1) softening the exterior of the front, whether its by a trellis or some other means, 2) providing some kind of landscaping that can screen the retaining walls however they might propose to do that, and 3) refinishing the exterior wall however they propose to do that. He added that staff has a concern with the 5-year requirement for review of the trees only because these trees

are not unique in that respect from other trees that are required in other mitigations and they would be creating a City-wide policy one project at a time. He asked that that not be part of this project but let the Council decide what the policy is with regard to inspecting trees. C Frautschi: does Council not give the City arborist leeway to lay the guidelines for 3-5 years. Was that not his recommendation? Don't we therefore then have the right to say five years. CDD Ewing: It's his recommendation but it's really a policy call as to what the City is going to impose as a requirement. I think there's significant staff burden if we start requiring 5-year inspections on all trees that are planted in the City and I would rather have that conversation as a City-wide issue rather than imposing one project at a time. C Frautschi: then I would respectfully say that we should not be given that option if it's making policy in a report because that was our choice that we were given. CDD Ewing: that's a fair comment. C Long: it sounds like we'll strike the requirement for 5 years, and we can agree to that we can have that discussion off line but then we were going to soften the front façade rather than dictating the details of that so.... C Gibson: A keyhole is going to be tough to do because you're taking a plain cut in the dirt and you have to have a certain thickness of wall and I don't see how you're going to cut a keyhole out of that so maybe we want to be a little less directive just as Craig has said and just say soften the wall somehow. C Frautschi: I see them do it on the interstate all the time – if they can do it on the Interstate they surely can do it on a driveway. Chair Parsons: Like we did on 6<sup>th</sup> avenue for the senior assisted home.

Mr. Chapman: A retaining wall has a vertical wall that's 6", 12" or whatever was required by the design from the soils engineer. At the bottom of that wall normally is what's referred to as a spread footing – that's an upside down T that sometimes will extend 5' in this case into the driveway and this footing may be as deep as 24" thick. In order to hold back the mass of the wall you have this large footing. To take and try to do a keyway in there for planting what you're going to be doing is creating this keyway with a little dirt in it but concrete on 4 sides so the roots are only going to be able to grow in a flower pot if you want to put it that way – it's just going to be one long flower pot. If you want to soften the wall here then we plant a vine that would fall down the wall to soften it instead of trying to have it grow up because of the mass of the footing. That whole front driveway may be two feet thick from one side to the other. So you're planting in concrete pots is what you're doing. There's no place for these roots to grow and spread. It becomes a structural problem which can't be designed around.

C Frautschi: On El Camino when they plant trees they plant root barriers that force the roots to go down– they pour rebar to form areas in planting. I've seen it done in other areas to soften retaining walls.

CDD Ewing: I would ask that you direct that back to you on consent so you can see the specific language of the conditions. We would have that back at your next meeting.

PP de Mel the Arborist report recommended 3 years. And the staff report carried over the recommendation of the arborist. Actually indicated on page 10 of 17 of the Arborist Report, 3 years special conditions concerning 1, 2, 4 and 5. It has not ever gone to 5. So we're at 3 years for the special condition 7.

CDD Ewing: we are suggesting and the condition that we are proposing to bring back to you in a resolution would be that the applicant has to come back to you with a landscape plan that accomplishes certain things, one of which is to provide plant screening of the retaining wall and that's the performance standard they have to meet however they choose to complete it.

C Wozniak seconded the motion

Ayes: Long, Horton, Gibson, Wozniak, Frautschi, Parsons

Noes: Dickenson

Motion passed 6/1.

Chair Parsons said that they will come back with a detailed motion at the next meeting. CDD Ewing added that it would have to be direction to staff to prepare a resolution to return to you for final review at your next meeting. Parsons: ok, and at that time the project can be appealed within ten days following the next meeting.

5C. PUBLIC HEARING – 2837 San Juan Boulevard

To consider a Single Family Design Review to construct a new 3,103 square foot single family residence that is below the zoning district permitted 3,108 square feet for this site.

(Appl. No. 2004-0054)

APN: 043-322-540; Zoned: R-1B (Single Family Residential)

CEQA Status: Categorical Exemption per Section 15303

Applicant: Steve Simpson

Owner(s): Jim & Sherri Lunsford

PP de Melo summarized the staff report, recommending project approval subject to the conditions attached.

The Commission had no questions of staff.

Steve Simpson, project architect, stated that he is a 15-year resident of San Juan Canyon and explained that he approached the project with the overriding design consideration to try to minimize the mass and to step the house back from the street. He clarified that it is his understanding that the easement has been recorded within the last 12 months.

C Horton wanted to make sure that the neighbor who has been parking on the subject property and who was in the audience was aware of the project.

C Long complimented Mr. Simpson on the plans and suggested to staff that if they could receive more plans like these it would make it a lot quicker and easier to evaluate the plans.

Chair Parsons opened the public hearing.

Jerry Chapman, San Juan Boulevard, property owner whose cars have been parked on the property for 30 years, stated that he and his wife will be leaving town shortly but that their daughter will be there and she only has one car. He stated that he worked with Steve Simpson and the new owners quite extensively on the design of the project, and that the house was designed so that he will have his privacy and access in and out of his garage, and that everything he had asked for was considered in the design.

**MOTION: By C Frautschi, seconded by VC Dickenson, to close the public hearing. Motion passed.**

C Wozniak echoed C Long's comments and liked the house, the colors, the way it looks on the lot, and the fact that they kept some of the trees in the front.

C Frautschi concurred, and felt that the roof line was interesting and articulated, it is a large house but does not look large, and it fits into its setting. He wished that every report could have a page A2.

C Horton, C Gibson and C Long concurred with all of the previous comments.

C Parsons concurred but noted that there is no detailed Landscape Plan and the site will need a sprinkler system. The project should be conditional on bringing back a Landscape Plan for final approval.

**MOTION: By VC Dickenson, seconded by C Long, to adopt the resolution approving a Single-Family Design Review at 2837 San Juan Boulevard , with the added condition that a landscape and irrigation plan be returned to the Planning Commission for final approval prior to the issuance of building permits (Appl. 2004-0054).**

**Ayes: Dickenson, Long, Frautschi, Gibson, Horton, Wozniak, Parsons**

**Noes: None**

**Motion passed 7/0**

Chair Parsons noted that this item may be appealed to the City Council within 10 days.

## **6. REPORTS, STUDIES, UPDATES AND COMMENTS**

### **6A. Choose an Alternate or Replacement for C Gibson on the Permit Efficiency Task Force**

**(Added to the Agenda under Item 2, Agenda Amendments)**

C Gibson stated that he will need to be replaced or at least have an alternate to attend the meetings of the Permit Efficiency Task Force since he has classes on Wednesday and Thursday nights through May, and in late June will have classes on Monday and Wednesday nights. C Horton and VC Dickenson are also members of the Task Force. CDD Ewing noted that it will probably meet 6 to 8 times over the next 6 months to look at improvements to the City's procedures for building and planning, and that in addition to the 3 Planning Commissioners membership includes 2 council members and 6 citizens. C Frautschi agreed to attend the meetings whenever he is available.

C Long reported that he will have to miss the next Planning Commission meeting as he will be in China.

CDD Ewing reported as follows:

- At their April 12<sup>th</sup> meeting, the City Council will be discussing the urban design planning grant that Sam Trans applied for on behalf of the cities of Belmont, San Carlos and Redwood City to take the visioning work that was done by the Urban Design Committee two years ago to the next step of some detailed plans and cost estimates for streetscape improvements on El Camino, Ralston and Old County Road. One of the questions Council will be asked is how they want to take in community input, with the option being recommended by staff that the Planning Commission conduct the community meetings so that the Commission becomes the recommending body. Other options will be to appoint a new committee or just hold open workshops. He suggested that Commissioners speak to a council member if they do not agree with staff's recommendation.

April 6<sup>th</sup> is the Permit Efficiency Task Force kickoff meeting. The Task Force will be conducting interviews or surveys with previous applicants for Single-Family Design Reviews and commercial projects going back to 2001, plus the building permit data base.

City Hall Phase I is nearing completion; the Permit Center will probably be moving the permit center down to the first floor in about a month, and the lobby and council chambers will perhaps be open beginning in May. Community Development will be in temporary quarters for about two months while their current space is being remodeled.

Parks and Rec Director Karl Mittelstadt is retiring at the end of June, after 36 years of service starting in 1969 with the City of Belmont. CDD Ewing suggested that suggestions for any citizen activities on his behalf be referred to the Parks and Rec Commission.

C Frautschi thanked CDD Ewing for steer-heading the Noise Ordinance Workshop. He really enjoyed it and looks forward to making good legislation. CDD Ewing noted that noise comments were emailed to Commissioners.

PP de Melo reported that at the end of the meeting he would be distributing a Project Tracking report which now not only includes what has happened in the past but also a list of all projects that have been submitted within the last few months. The list will also include final Landscape Plans, Notre Dame High School status report, Safeway code compliance reports, and items such as appeals that will go the Council, and will give them an idea of what to expect over the coming months. CDD Ewing added that the backlog is about 6 months, assuming that they take 3 to 4 cases each meeting.

Responding to C Horton's question, PP de Melo stated that Ralston Village is planned for the April 19<sup>th</sup> agenda. C Horton noted that she will be recusing

herself and C Long will be absent. CDD Ewing emphasized that the other Commissioners all need to be there so they can preserve a quorum, and suggested that C Long review a draft of the minutes so that he can be prepared to deliberate and any future meetings on the subject. RS Flores will be sure he receives the packet for the meeting.

Chair Parsons reported as follows:

- He and VC Dickenson will be meeting with staff to discuss ways that they might be able to make things easier for everyone.

Commented on his responsibilities as chair of membership for the Belmont/Notre Dame Subcommittee and reported on a recent event with the clients of the Center for Independence of the Disabled.

He had noticed that day that Notre Dame High School had 50-60 shrubs lined up along the fence on Notre Dame Avenue. It looked to him like they are going to be putting in a landscape barrier and fixing up the sidewalk, but they have not yet taken the batting cage down.

C Horton pointed out that the bull horns are in full force on weekends at Notre Dame.

## **7. PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF TUESDAY, APRIL 12, 2005**

liaison: Commissioner Wozniak

Alternate Liaison: Chair Parsons

It was noted that Charles Armstrong School is expected to be on the meeting agenda.

## **9. ADJOURNMENT:**

the meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m. to a regular meeting on Tuesday, April 19, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. at Twin Pines Senior and Community Center.

---



Craig A. Ewing, AICP

Planning Commission Secretary

*Audiotapes of Planning Commission Meetings are available for review*

*in the Community Development Department*

*Please call (650) 595-7416 to schedule an appointment.*